

Christopher R. Pitoun (SBN 290235)
HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP
301 N. Lake Avenue, Suite 920
Pasadena, California 91101
Telephone: (213) 330-7150
Facsimile: (213) 330-7152
Email: christopherp@hbsslaw.com

Robert B. Carey (*pro hac vice*)
Leonard W. Aragon (*pro hac vice*)
Michella A. Kras (*pro hac vice*)
HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP
11 West Jefferson, Suite 1000
Phoenix, Arizona 85003
Telephone: (602) 840-5900
Facsimile: (602) 840-3012
Email: rob@hbsslaw.com
leonarda@hbsslaw.com
michellak@hbsslaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

(Additional Counsel on Signature Page)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

N.Z., R.M., B.L., S.M., and A.L.,
individually and on behalf of themselves
and all others similarly situated.

Plaintiffs,

V.

FENIX INTERNATIONAL LIMITED,
FENIX INTERNET LLC, BOSS
BADDIES LLC, MOXY
MANAGEMENT, UNRULY AGENCY
LLC (also d/b/a DYSRPT AGENCY),
BEHAVE AGENCY LLC, A.S.H.
AGENCY, CONTENT X, INC., VERGE
AGENCY, INC., AND ELITE
CREATORS LLC.

Defendants.

Case No. 8:24-cv-01655-FWS-SSC

**PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE IN
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS
FENIX INTERNATIONAL
LIMITED'S AND FENIX
INTERNET LLC'S MOTION TO
DISMISS FOR LACK OF
PERSONAL JURISDICTION,
FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM,
AND IMPROPER VENUE**

**[REDACTED VERSION OF
DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE
FILED UNDER SEAL]**

Judge: Hon. Fred W. Slaughter
Courtroom: 10D
Date: September 4, 2025
Time: 10:00 a.m.

1 TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. BACKGROUND.....	2
III. ARGUMENT	4
A. The Court Has Personal Jurisdiction Over Fenix Defendants.	4
1. Fenix Purposefully Directed Its Conduct Toward—and Availed Itself of Doing Business in—California.	5
2. Plaintiffs' Claims Arise from Fenix's California Contacts	8
3. Exercising Jurisdiction Is Fair and Reasonable.....	9
4. The Court Has Personal Jurisdiction Over Fenix Under § 1965(b) Because Plaintiffs Allege a Single, Coordinated RICO Conspiracy.....	10
5. Alternatively, Fenix's Contacts Support General Jurisdiction.....	12
6. Venue is proper as to Plaintiff R.M.....	13
B. Plaintiffs did not consent—either explicitly or implicitly—to the Chatter Scams.....	14
C. Section 230 Does Not Bar Plaintiffs' Claims.	16
1. The Fenix Defendants Ignore the Scores of Allegations in the FAC that Detail Their Affirmative Misrepresentations.....	16
2. Section 230 does not apply to Fenix's Own Statements and Conduct.	17
D. Plaintiffs Have Plausibly Alleged a Breach of Contract by the Fenix Defendants.	18

1	E. Plaintiffs Allege a Colorable RICO and RICO Conspiracy	20
2	Claim Against the Fenix Defendants	
3	F. Plaintiffs plausibly allege that Fenix committed fraud and	23
4	actively concealed the Chatter Scams.....	
5	G. Plaintiffs plausibly allege deceit under California Civil	25
6	Code § 1709.	
7	H. Plaintiffs sufficiently plead their VPPA claim.	27
8	1. Defendants qualify as video tape service providers	
9	because they delivered audiovisual content as a core	
10	monetized feature of the platform.	27
11	2. Plaintiffs qualify as consumers because they subscribed	
12	to and paid for video services operated by Defendants.....	28
13	3. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants Disclosed Personally	
14	Identifiable Information.....	29
15	4. These disclosures were made to unauthorized third	
16	parties, outside the ordinary course of business.	31
17	I. Fenix's Violation of CIPA is Clear.....	32
18	1. The OnlyFans Terms of Service and Privacy Policy Do	
19	Not Disclose the Actual Interception Scheme.....	33
20	2. Consent is a Fact-Intensive Inquiry and is Otherwise	
21	Inapplicable.....	34
22	3. Plaintiffs Have Adequately Pled Fenix's "Aiding and	
23	Abetting.".....	35
24	J. Plaintiffs adequately plead a CDAFA claim against Fenix.....	35
25	1. CDAFA applies to both unauthorized access and	
26	misuse of access—no "hacking" is required.	36
27	2. Plaintiffs allege that Fenix violated § 502(c)(2) by	
28	enabling the unauthorized copying and use of Fan	
	communications.....	36

1	3.	Fenix violated § 502(c)(3) by misusing platform services to enable fraud.	36
2	4.	Fenix violated § 502(c)(7) by facilitating the use of private data to extract money.	37
3	5.	Plaintiffs allege concrete economic harm sufficient for CDAFA standing.	37
4			
5	K.	Plaintiffs Adequately Plead Standing and State a Claim Under All Three UCL Prongs	38
6			
7	1.	Plaintiffs have UCL standing based on concrete economic harm.	38
8			
9	2.	Under the UCL's Fraudulent Prong, the FAC adequately alleges a scheme likely to deceive the public.	38
10			
11	3.	Under the UCL's Unfair Prong, Plaintiffs state a claim based on systematic impersonation fraud and platform- level exploitation.	40
12			
13	4.	Under the UCL's Unlawful Prong, Plaintiffs allege multiple predicate violations.	41
14			
15	L.	The FAC also states a claim under California's False Advertising Law.	42
16			
17	IV.	CONCLUSION	43
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)	
2	Cases
3	
4	<i>In re Apple & AT&T iPad Unlimited Data Plan Litig.</i> , 802 F. Supp. 2d 1070 (N.D. Cal. 2011).....25
5	
6	<i>Archer v. NBCUniversal Media, LLC</i> , No. 2:24-CV-10744-AB-JC, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 129598 (C.D. Cal. July 2, 2025).....29, 30, 32
7	
8	
9	<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009)
10	25
11	
12	<i>Barnes v. Yahoo!</i> , 570 F.3d 1096 (9th Cir. 2009).....16, 17, 20
13	
14	<i>Baumer v. Pachl</i> , 8 F.3d 1341 (9th Cir. 1993).....10
15	
16	<i>Boschma v. Home Loan Ctr., Inc.</i> , 198 Cal. App. 4th 230 (2011).....23
17	
18	<i>Bray v. Kendall</i> , 2010 WL 56181 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 5, 2010)
19	12
20	
21	<i>Briskin v. Shopify, Inc.</i> , 135 F.4th 739 (9th Cir. 2025).....4, 5, 7, 9
22	
23	<i>Briskin v. Shopify, Inc.</i> , 135 F.4th at 750–51
24	4, 7
25	
26	<i>Brown v. Google LLC</i> , 685 F. Supp. 3d 909 (N.D. Cal. 2023).....18
27	
28	<i>Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz</i> , 471 U.S. 462 (1985)
29	10, 11
30	
31	<i>Butcher's Union Loc. No. 498 v. SDC Inv., Inc.</i> , 788 F.2d 535 (9th Cir. 1986)
32	10, 11
33	
34	<i>Calise v. Meta Platforms, Inc.</i> , 103 F.4th 732
35	17, 20, 31

1	<i>Carey v. J.A.K.'s Puppies, Inc.</i> , 763 F. Supp. 3d 952, 983 (C.D. Cal. 2025).....	10, 22
3	<i>Cascade Yarns, Inc. v. Knitting Fever, Inc.</i> , 4 2011 WL 4538422 (W.D. Wash. Jan. 3, 2011).....	11, 12
5	<i>Cel-Tech Commc 'ns, Inc. v. L.A. Cellular Tel. Co.</i> , 6 20 Cal. 4th 163 (1999).....	40, 41
7	<i>Comm. on Children's Television v. Gen. Foods Corp.</i> , 8 35 Cal. 3d 197 (1983).....	38
9	<i>Doe v. Grindr Inc.</i> , 10 128 F.4th 1148 (9th Cir. 2025).....	18
11	<i>Doe v. Match Group</i> , 12 2022 WL 4551660 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 12, 2022).....	13
13	<i>Doe v. Roblox Corp.</i> , 14 602 F. Supp. 3d 1243 (N.D. Cal. 2022).....	19
15	<i>Doe v. Walmart Inc.</i> , 16 2019 WL 499754 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 8, 2019).....	10
17	<i>Eclectic Props. E., LLC v. Marcus & Millichap Co.</i> , 18 751 F.3d 990 (9th Cir. 2014).....	20
19	<i>Eichenberger v. ESPN, Inc.</i> , 20 876 F.3d 979 (9th Cir. 2017).....	27, 29, 31
21	<i>Ellis v. Cartoon Network, Inc.</i> , 22 803 F.3d 1251 (11th Cir. 2015).....	29
23	<i>ESAB Grp., Inc. v. Centricut, Inc.</i> , 24 126 F.3d 617 (4th Cir. 1997).....	12
25	<i>Est. of Bride v. YOLO Techs., Inc.</i> , 26 112 F.4th 1168.....	19
27	<i>In re Facebook, Inc.</i> , 28 402 F. Supp. 3d 767 (N.D. Cal. 2019).....	31, 37
29	<i>Gilbert v. Bank of Am.</i> , 30 No. C 13-01171 JSW, 2014 WL 4748494 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 31 2014).....	11

1	<i>Glob. Commodities Trading Grp., Inc. v. Beneficio de Arroz Choloma, S.A.,</i> 972 F.3d 1101 (9th Cir. 2020).....	8
2		
3	<i>Goodyear Dunlop Tires Ops., S.A. v. Brown,</i> 564 U.S. 915 (2011)	12
4		
5	<i>In re Google Inc. Gmail Litig.,</i> 2014 WL 1102660 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2014)	34
6		
7	<i>Graham v. Bank of Am., N.A.,</i> 226 Cal. App. 4th 594 (2014).....	26
8		
9	<i>Howard v. Am. Online Inc.,</i> 208 F.3d 741 (9th Cir. 2000).....	20
10		
11	<i>In re Hulu Privacy Litig.,</i> 86 F. Supp. 3d 1090 (N.D. Cal. 2015).....	27, 28, 31
12		
13	<i>In re JUUL Labs, Inc., Mktg., Sales Pracs. & Prods. Liab. Litig.,</i> 497 F. Supp. 3d 552 (N.D. Cal. 2020).....	24
14		
15	<i>Kwikset Corp. v. Superior Court,</i> 51 Cal. 4th 310 (2011).....	38
16		
17	<i>Lazar v. Superior Ct.,</i> 12 Cal. 4th 631 (1996).....	23, 26
18		
19	<i>LiMandri v. Judkins,</i> 52 Cal. App. 4th 326 (1997).....	23
20		
21	<i>Lovejoy v. AT&T Corp.,</i> 92 Cal. App. 4th 85 (2001).....	26
22		
23	<i>Mendoza v. Amalgamated Transit Union Int'l,</i> 30 F.4th 879 (9th Cir. 2022).....	24
24		
25	<i>Mir v. Greines, Martin, Stein & Richland,</i> No. 2:14-4132-CAS.....	11
26		
27	<i>Moore v. Trader Joe's Co.,</i> 4 F.4th 874 (9th Cir. 2021).....	39
28		
	<i>Oasis W. Realty, LLC v. Goldman,</i> 51 Cal. App. 5th 811 (2020).....	18

1	<i>Odom v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 486 F.3d 541 (9th Cir. 2007) (en banc)	21
3	<i>Opperman v. Path, Inc.</i> , 84 F. Supp. 3d 962 (N.D. Cal. 2015).....	15
5	<i>People v. Childs</i> , 220 Cal. App. 4th 1079 (2013).....	36
7	<i>People v. McKale</i> , 25 Cal. 3d 626 (1979).....	41
9	<i>Poston v. Gen. Motors, LLC</i> , 2024 WL 3558377 (S.D. Cal. July 22, 2024).....	25
10	<i>R.C. v. Walgreen Co.</i> , 733 F. Supp. 3d 876 (C.D. Cal. 2024).....	34
12	<i>Republic of Panama v. BCCI Holdings (Luxembourg) S.A.</i> , 119 F.3d 935 (11th Cir. 1997).....	12
14	<i>Salinas v. United States</i> , 522 U.S. 52 (1997)	10
16	<i>Schnall v. Hertz Corp.</i> , 78 Cal. App. 4th 1144 (2000).....	39, 40
18	<i>Schwarzenegger v. Fred Martin Motor Co.</i> , 374 F.3d 797 (9th Cir. 2004).....	4, 8
20	<i>Simeon Mgmt. Corp. v. FTC</i> , 579 F.2d 1137 (9th Cir. 1978).....	39
22	<i>Sun Sav. & Loan Ass'n v. Dierdorff</i> , 825 F.2d 187 (9th Cir. 1987).....	22
23	<i>United States v. Rogers</i> , 321 F.3d 1226 (9th Cir. 2003).....	22
25	<i>In re Vizio, Inc., Consumer Privacy Litig.</i> , 238 F. Supp. 3d 1204 (C.D. Cal. 2017).....	15, 28
27	<i>Yamashita v. LG Chem, Ltd.</i> , 62 F.4th 496 (9th Cir. 2023).....	8
28		

1 **Statutes**

2	18 U.S.C. § 1343.....	34
3	18 U.S.C. § 1965.....	10
4	18 U.S.C. § 2710.....	27, 28, 29, 31
5	28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).....	14
6	47 U.S. Code § 230.....	<i>passim</i>
7	Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17204	38
8	Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1709–1710	41
9	Cal. Penal Code § 502	35, 36, 37
10	Cal. Penal Code § 631(a).....	35
11	California Civil Code § 1709.....	25, 26, 41
12	California's Comprehensive Computer Data Access and Fraud Act (CDAFA)	35
13	California's False Advertising Law.....	42
14	False Advertising Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500).....	41, 42
15	RICO	<i>passim</i>
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

I. INTRODUCTION

This case is about a bait-and-switch at the heart of the OnlyFans platform.
Users are promised direct communication with specific Creators. They pay
money—often lots of it—under the belief that they are chatting with the real
person whose account they follow. In reality, many of those conversations are
faked. Agencies that manage OnlyFans accounts, including the Agency Defendants
named in this lawsuit, staff them with paid “Chatters”—often offshore workers paid
low wages to impersonate Creators, mimic their voice, escalate intimacy, and push
paid content. Fenix enables this deception by design—building and monetizing
systems that facilitate impersonation while publicly denying knowledge that
impersonations take place.

14 Fenix International Limited owns OnlyFans and, together with its U.S.
15 subsidiary Fenix Internet LLC (together “Fenix” or “Fenix Defendants”) operates
16 the platform. Plaintiffs allege that Fenix facilitates this impersonation scheme
17 through a combination of product design, selective enforcement, and financial
18 incentives. Plaintiffs allege that Fenix knows what is happening, benefits from it,
19 and protects the highest-earning operators from consequences. The Agencies, in
20 turn, treat Creator accounts as commercial storefronts, staffed with Chatters trained
21 to simulate emotional connection and push high-dollar content. What appears to be
22 one-on-one communication is, in many cases, a scripted performance driven by
23 conversion metrics. Plaintiffs allege that the Fenix Defendants know this—and
24 conceal it.

27 Plaintiffs bring claims sounding in fraud, breach of contract, consumer
28 protection, and privacy violations. At this stage, the question is not whether the

1 Fenix Defendants' scheme was lawful or justified. It is whether Plaintiffs have
2 plausibly alleged misconduct. They have. The First Amended Complaint identifies
3 who did what, when, and how—often using the Fenix Defendants' own materials—
4 and is more than sufficient to survive the Fenix Defendants' multiple motions to
5 dismiss.
6

7 This brief responds to the motion to dismiss filed by the Fenix Defendants.
8 None of their arguments support dismissal.

9 II. BACKGROUND

10 **The OnlyFans Platform.** OnlyFans is an online platform that allows users
11 (“Fans”) to subscribe to and interact with content creators (“Creators”), many of
12 whom produce adult content. FAC ¶ 3. Fans pay monthly subscription fees and can
13 also spend money on direct messages, tips, and pay-per-view (PPV) videos. *Id.* The
14 platform markets itself as a vehicle for one-on-one connections between Fans and
15 Creators, leading Fans to believe that what they are paying for is a personal
16 relationship with the Creator whose account they follow. FAC ¶¶ 6, 8, 79, 109.

17 **The Chatter Scams.** In many cases, that one-on-one communication
18 OnlyFans promises is fake. Plaintiffs allege that Creator accounts are often
19 managed by third-party agencies—some of which are named as Defendants in this
20 case—that use offshore workers (“Chatters”) to impersonate Creators in private
21 messages. FAC ¶¶ 112, 122–134. These Chatters are trained to mimic a Creator’s
22 voice, deepen emotional engagement, and maximize purchases of PPV content and
23 other paid features. FAC ¶¶ 133–134, 151–156. Fans are not told that someone else
24 is operating the Creator’s account, and the OnlyFans interface is designed to sustain
25 the illusion of real, personal interaction. FAC ¶¶ 144–149.
26
27

1 **Fenix's Role.** Fenix International Limited along with its U.S. subsidiary,
2 Fenix Internet LLC, (together "Fenix") own and operate the OnlyFans platform.
3 FAC ¶¶ 7, 108. It designs and controls the user interface, payment systems,
4 moderation policies, and account analytics tools. FAC ¶¶ 135–145. Although
5 Fenix's Terms of Service prohibit account sharing and impersonation, Plaintiffs
6 allege that Fenix knowingly tolerates widespread violations of those rules—
7 particularly when they generate substantial revenue. FAC ¶¶ 153–158. Fenix has
8 the ability to detect impersonation through metadata anomalies, geolocation
9 mismatches, and chat irregularities, yet it selectively enforces its policies and
10 protects top-earning accounts. FAC ¶¶ 138–149.

11 **Plaintiffs' Experience.** Each named Plaintiff is a male OnlyFans user who
12 subscribed to one or more Creator accounts, paid subscription fees, sent tips, and
13 purchased content based on the belief that he was communicating directly with the
14 Creator. FAC ¶¶ 241–299. Plaintiffs allege they were emotionally manipulated,
15 deceived about the identity of the person they were speaking to, and financially
16 exploited by a scheme designed to simulate intimacy for profit. *Id.*

17 **Procedural History.** Plaintiffs filed this action on July 29, 2024, and
18 amended their complaint on April 23, 2025. Dkts. 1, 118. On April 9, 2025, the
19 Court granted Fenix's forum non conveniens motion in part, dismissing the claims
20 of three out-of-state Plaintiffs (B.L., S.M., and A.L.) against the Fenix Defendants.
21 The Court denied the motion as to California-resident Plaintiffs N.Z. and R.M. *See*
22 Dkt. 117. Plaintiffs' claims against the Agency Defendants were unaffected, and the
23 First Amended Complaint reflects this outcome. *See* FAC ¶ 24 (limiting claims
24
25
26
27
28

1 against the Fenix Defendants to N.Z. and R.M.).¹ This brief responds to the Fenix
2 Defendants' Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction, Failure to State a
3 Claim, and Improper Venue ("Motion"), filed at Dkt. 121. Plaintiffs' oppositions to
4 Fenix's other pending motions—including the motion to strike and request for
5 judicial notice—are filed concurrently.

7 III. ARGUMENT

8 A. The Court Has Personal Jurisdiction Over Fenix Defendants.

9 To establish specific personal jurisdiction, Plaintiffs must show either (1) that
10 the Fenix Defendants purposefully directed their conduct toward California, or (2)
11 that they purposefully availed themselves of the privilege of conducting business
12 here. *See Schwarzenegger v. Fred Martin Motor Co.*, 374 F.3d 797, 802 (9th Cir.
13 2004); *Briskin v. Shopify, Inc.*, 135 F.4th 739, 750–51 (9th Cir. 2025).² Plaintiffs
14 also must show that their claims arise from the Fenix Defendants' California
15 contacts, and that exercising jurisdiction is fair and reasonable. *Id.* As explained
16 below, both tests are satisfied based on Fenix's systematic engagement with
17 California users and the harms that flowed directly from those contacts.

18 ¹ The Defendants now argue that the *forum non conveniens* ruling requires
19 dismissal of B.L., S.M., and A.L.'s claims in their entirety—including those
20 asserted against the Agency Defendants—but that argument lacks merit. *See*
21 Plaintiffs' Consolidated Response in Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Strike
22 Claims of Non-CA Defendants and Fenix Defendants' Motion for Request for
23 Judicial Notice ("Opp to Mot. to Strike and RFJN") at Section II. Plaintiffs address
24 those arguments in full in Opp to Mot. to Strike and RFJN, filed concurrently with
25 this brief.

26 ² Courts in this Circuit generally apply the "purposeful availment" test to
27 contract-based claims and the "purposeful direction" test to tort-based claims. *See*
28 *Schwarzenegger*, 374 F.3d at 802. Because Plaintiffs assert both types of claims
here, including deceptive practices and breach of contract, both tests are properly
applied. *See Briskin v. Shopify, Inc.*, 135 F.4th at 750–51.

1 **1. Fenix Purposefully Directed Its Conduct Toward—and Availed
2 Itself of Doing Business in—California.**

3 ***Purposeful Direction.*** For tort claims, the Ninth Circuit applies the “effects
4 test” from *Calder v. Jones*, which asks whether the defendant: (1) committed an
5 intentional act, (2) expressly aimed at the forum, and (3) caused harm that the
6 defendant knew would be suffered in the forum. *Briskin v. Shopify, Inc.*, 135 F.4th
7 739, 751 (9th Cir. 2025).

8 Here, the FAC alleges that Fenix deliberately targeted California through
9 platform design, Creator onboarding, identity verification, and a payment
10 infrastructure that monetized impersonation-based chats. *See* FAC ¶¶ 3, 6–8, 98–
11 100, 108–149, 224–225. [REDACTED]

12 [REDACTED]

13 [REDACTED]

14 [REDACTED]

15 [REDACTED]

16 [REDACTED]

17 [REDACTED]

18 [REDACTED]

19 [REDACTED]

20 [REDACTED]

21 These figures represent roughly 10% of Fenix’s global net revenue during that
22 period. *See* FAC ¶ 132.

23 This commercial engagement was neither accidental nor incidental. [REDACTED]

24 [REDACTED]

25 [REDACTED]

27 ³ Declaration of Robert B. Carey (“Carey Decl.”), Ex. A, at Resp. No. 4.

28 ⁴ *Id.*

1 [REDACTED].⁵ See
2 also *Fenix Int'l Ltd. Annual Report* at 3 (reporting 4,118,000 total Creator accounts
3 as of 2023).⁶

4 Fenix actively cultivated these relationships. Plaintiffs allege—and the
5 platform confirms—that Fenix affirmatively verifies Creators by collecting
6 government-issued ID, social media handles, and bank account details. FAC ¶¶
7 135–136, 138, 224–225. [REDACTED]

8 [REDACTED] These steps
9 [REDACTED] were not mechanical—they were a necessary prerequisite to revenue participation
10 in California.

11 Fenix also engaged in public-facing promotional conduct that reinforced its
12 ties to the state. Executives promoted the platform alongside California-based
13 Creators at public events. FAC ¶ 142. Fenix co-sponsored campaigns with Agency
14 Defendants, including one featured at Miami Swim Week—but importantly, that
15 campaign was launched and promoted by a California-based Agency Defendant.
16 FAC ¶ 143. Each of these efforts in California helped normalize and scale the
17 deceptive practices at the heart of this case.

18 Fenix's promotional activities extended to its most senior leadership. CEO
19 Keily Blair has repeatedly appeared at public events in California to promote
20 OnlyFans' business model and growth strategy—often alongside California-based
21

22 ⁵ Carey Decl., Ex. A, at Resp. Nos. 3 and 4.

23 ⁶ *Fenix International Ltd., Annual Report and Consolidated Financial*
24 *Statements for the Year Ended 30 November 2024*, at 3, available at <https://find-and-update.company-information.service.gov.uk/company/10354575/filing-history>.

1 Creators.⁷ These included speaking engagements at the 2024 Bloomberg
2 Screentime conference in Los Angeles and the “Masters of Scale” summit series in
3 San Francisco in both 2022 and 2025. Such appearances underscore Fenix’s
4 deliberate cultivation of a California audience through high-profile brand
5 positioning.

7 Fenix’s OFTV platform further reflects this intentionality. Several OFTV
8 programs—such as *House of Sims* and *Surfing in California*—are filmed, set, or
9 produced in California.⁸ These shows are promoted to a U.S. audience and used to
10 strengthen user attachment to California-based Creators and lifestyle content.

11 The Ninth Circuit in *Briskin* held that “express aiming” may be shown by the
12 interactivity of a defendant’s website, the geographic scope of its commercial
13 ambitions, and whether the defendant engaged in conduct targeting users in the
14 forum. 135 F.4th at 753–54. Fenix meets all three criteria. OnlyFans is an intensely
15 interactive platform built around user-to-Creator engagement. Fenix did not
16 passively permit commerce in California—it cultivated and monetized it.

17
18
19
20
21 ⁷ See, e.g., <https://variety.com/2024/digital/news/onlyfans-sex-content-creators-20-billion-dollars-ceo-1236175515/> (Keily Blair, speaker at Bloomberg Screenshot conference, Los Angeles, CA, Oct. 2024); <https://www.instagram.com/reel/DF8-yThSt4i/> (Blair speaking at “Masters of Scale” Summit, San Francisco, CA, 2022); https://www.linkedin.com/posts/keilyblair_mastersofscale-mossummit-summit2025-activity-7316429904344932352-K8AG?utm_source=share&utm_medium=member_desktop (Blair listed as speaker at 2025 “Masters of Scale” Summit in San Francisco, CA).

22
23
24
25
26
27
28 ⁸ See, e.g., *House of Sims*, <https://www.tubefilter.com/2023/04/21/only-fans-reality-shows-house-of-sims-towie-model-farmers-oftv/> (“House of Sims will follow Chloe and her family members Frankie, Demi, and Charlie as they move from Essex to Los Angeles.”); *Surfing in California*, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RUAgvUxAw6g>.

1 **Purposeful Availment.** Fenix’s conduct also satisfies the purposeful
2 availment standard, which applies to Plaintiffs’ contract-based claims. That test
3 asks whether a defendant “purposefully avails itself of the privilege of conducting
4 activities within the forum State, thus invoking the benefits and protections of its
5 laws.” *Schwarzenegger v. Fred Martin Motor Co.*, 374 F.3d 797, 802 (9th Cir.
6 2004). Courts assess a defendant’s “entire course of dealing” with the forum—not
7 merely the particular contract or incident giving rise to the claim. *Glob.*
8 *Commodities Trading Grp., Inc. v. Beneficio de Arroz Choloma, S.A.*, 972 F.3d
9 1101, 1108 (9th Cir. 2020); *see also Yamashita v. LG Chem, Ltd.*, 62 F.4th 496, 503
10 (9th Cir. 2023) (“We examine whether the defendant deliberately reached out
11 beyond its home—by, for example, exploiting a market in the forum State or
12 entering a contractual relationship centered there.”).
13

14 The same facts that establish purposeful direction also support purposeful
15 availment. These are not the contacts of a passive website operator—they reflect a
16 deliberate and sustained effort to engage with this forum and benefit from its laws.
17

18 **2. Plaintiffs’ Claims Arise from Fenix’s California Contacts**

19 Plaintiffs allege that they subscribed to Creator accounts, paid for
20 personalized interactions, and were deceived by the Chatter Scams—which Fenix
21 enabled and monetized. FAC ¶¶ 81–95, 122–149. These injuries stem directly from
22 Fenix’s California-facing operations—including the recruitment and onboarding of
23 California-based Creators, the processing of payments from California-based Fans,
24 and the concealment of Chatter Scams using standardized interface language that
25 Fenix itself designed and controlled. FAC ¶¶ 98–100, 108–145, 224–225. Because
26 the conduct giving rise to Plaintiffs’ injuries occurred, in part, through Fenix’s
27

1 intentional engagement with California users, the “arising from” prong is satisfied.
2 *See Briskin v. Shopify, Inc.*, 135 F.4th 739, 750 (9th Cir. 2025) (“A claim arises out
3 of a defendant’s forum-related activities if it would not have occurred but for the
4 defendant’s contacts with the forum.”).

5 **3. Exercising Jurisdiction Is Fair and Reasonable**

6 Fenix is a global company with extensive and sustained ties to California. As
7 detailed above, [REDACTED]
8 [REDACTED] .⁹
9 [REDACTED]
10 [REDACTED].¹⁰

11 Fenix’s relationships with California users were not fleeting or incidental.
12 The company affirmatively verified California-based Creators and processed
13 recurring payments from Fans in the state. FAC ¶¶ 39–43, 223–24. Defendants do
14 not leave their market to chance. They decide where to do business—and explicitly
15 exclude residents of nearly half the world’s countries from participating as
16 Creators.¹¹ This is not a case where jurisdiction rests on isolated contacts—it rests
17 on a sustained course of business that generated substantial revenue and user
18 engagement in this forum.

19 Litigating in California poses no unfair burden. The state has a manifest
20 interest in adjudicating deceptive business practices aimed at its residents—

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

⁹ Carey Decl., Ex. A, at Resp. No. 4. This represents a substantial portion of its
revenue, as Fenix reported total revenue of just over \$2.7 billion from 2019 to
2022. FAC ¶ 62.

¹⁰ Carey Decl., Ex. A, at Resp. Nos. 3 and 4.

¹¹ See Carey Decl., Ex. B, at 226:12–24 ([REDACTED]
[REDACTED]).

1 particularly those that implicate intimate impersonation and the unauthorized
2 sharing of private data. *See Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz*, 471 U.S. 462, 476–77
3 (1985). Because Plaintiffs have satisfied the first two prongs of the specific
4 jurisdiction test, the burden shifts to Fenix to show that the exercise of jurisdiction
5 would nonetheless be unreasonable. Its Motion fails to do so.

6

7 **4. The Court Has Personal Jurisdiction Over Fenix Under § 1965(b)
Because Plaintiffs Allege a Single, Coordinated RICO Conspiracy**

8 Under § 1965(b) of the RICO statute, a court with personal jurisdiction over
9 one defendant may assert jurisdiction over other co-conspirators when three
10 requirements are met: (1) the court has personal jurisdiction over at least one
11 defendant; (2) no other district court could exercise jurisdiction over all defendants;
12 and (3) the defendants are alleged to have participated in a single nationwide RICO
13 conspiracy. *See 18 U.S.C. § 1965(b); Butcher's Union Loc. No. 498 v. SDC Inv.,*
14 *Inc.*, 788 F.2d 535, 539 (9th Cir. 1986); *Doe v. Walmart Inc.*, 2019 WL 499754, at
15 *6 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 8, 2019). The third prong is satisfied where plaintiffs allege that
16 each defendant “was aware of the essential nature and scope of the enterprise and
17 intended to participate in it.” *Baumer v. Pachl*, 8 F.3d 1341, 1346 (9th Cir. 1993).
18 That participation need not be comprehensive: “[i]t suffices that [the conspirator]
19 adopt the goal of furthering or facilitating the criminal endeavor,” even if by
20 agreeing to “only some of the acts leading to the substantive offense.” *Salinas v.*
21 *United States*, 522 U.S. 52, 65 (1997). And specific intent may be inferred “by the
22 scheme itself,” if the facts plausibly suggest a plan calculated to deceive. *Carey v.*
23 *J.A.K.'s Puppies, Inc.*, 763 F. Supp. 3d 952, 983 (C.D. Cal. 2025).

24
25
26 As described more fully below, Plaintiffs allege a single, coordinated scheme
27 in which the Fenix Defendants and Agency Defendants acted in concert to mislead

1 Fans into believing they were forming direct, authentic relationships with
2 Creators. *See Section E, infra* (RICO). The FAC alleges that Fenix built trust and
3 facilitated access by marketing OnlyFans as a platform for “authentic connections,”
4 while the Agency Defendants operationalized the deception by supplying Chatter
5 labor and monetization strategies. FAC ¶¶ 13, 62, 112, 172–249. This model
6 was financially interdependent: agencies extracted revenue from Fans, and Fenix
7 took a 20 percent cut of every dollar. *Id.* ¶ 62. These allegations support a
8 reasonable inference of mutual awareness and cooperation—*i.e.*, an agreement to
9 participate in a common fraudulent enterprise. *See Cascade Yarns, Inc. v. Knitting*
10 *Fever, Inc.*, 2011 WL 4538422, at *8 (W.D. Wash. Jan. 3, 2011) (“an agreement
11 may be inferred from the specific acts and relationships alleged”).
12

13 Fenix’s reliance on *Butcher’s Union* and similar cases is misplaced.
14 In *Butcher’s Union*, the Ninth Circuit found no § 1965(b) jurisdiction where
15 plaintiffs alleged four independent conspiracies connected only by shared legal
16 counsel. 788 F.2d at 537–39. Here, by contrast, Plaintiffs allege a single fraudulent
17 scheme operating through a shared platform, unified economic model, and
18 coordinated messaging. *See* FAC ¶¶ 13–18, 77–91, 156, 384–404. Nor do
19 the *Gilbert* and *Mir* cases support Fenix’s position. In *Gilbert*, plaintiffs alleged two
20 distinct conspiracies with separate actors. *Gilbert v. Bank of Am.*, No. C 13-01171
21 JSW, 2014 WL 4748494, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 2014). In *Mir*, the complaint
22 failed to plead facts showing the defendant even *knew* of the conspiracy, much less
23 intended to participate. *Mir v. Greines, Martin, Stein & Richland*, No. 2:14-4132-
24 CAS FFMX, 2015 WL 4139435, at *13 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 12, 2015), *aff’d*, 676 F.
25 App’x 699 (9th Cir. 2017). By contrast, the FAC here sets out detailed factual
26
27
28

1 allegations—not conclusory labels—about Fenix’s role in facilitating and profiting
2 from the Chatter Scams. This includes specific conduct, economic interdependence,
3 and coordination across actors—hallmarks the Ninth Circuit has recognized as
4 sufficient to infer agreement. *See Cascade Yarns*, 2011 WL 4538422, at *8; *see*
5 *also* Section E, *infra*.

6
7 Accordingly, the requirements for § 1965(b) jurisdiction are satisfied. Fenix
8 does not dispute that the Court has jurisdiction over at least one defendant. Nor do
9 they identify any alternative forum where all defendants could be jointly sued. And
10 the FAC plausibly alleges a single, nationwide conspiracy—coordinated in purpose
11 and effect—in which all Defendants knowingly participated. That is sufficient at
12 the pleading stage to invoke § 1965(b).¹²
13

14 **5. Alternatively, Fenix’s Contacts Support General Jurisdiction**

15 Although Plaintiffs do not principally rely on general jurisdiction, Fenix’s
16 sustained commercial presence in California reinforces the fairness of litigating in
17 this forum. *See Goodyear Dunlop Tires Ops., S.A. v. Brown*, 564 U.S. 915, 919
18 (2011). From 2020 through 2024, [REDACTED]

19
20
21
22
23 ¹² Even if the Court finds § 1965(b) inapplicable, Plaintiffs also invoke
24 § 1965(d) as an alternative basis for personal jurisdiction. *See* FAC ¶ 22. Although
25 the Ninth Circuit has not directly addressed whether § 1965(d) permits nationwide
26 jurisdiction, the Fourth and Eleventh Circuits have held that it does. *See ESAB*
27 *Grp., Inc. v. Centricut, Inc.*, 126 F.3d 617, 626 (4th Cir. 1997); *Republic of Panama*
28 *v. BCCI Holdings (Luxembourg) S.A.*, 119 F.3d 935, 942 (11th Cir. 1997). At least
one district court in this Circuit has reached the opposite conclusion. *See Bray v.*
Kendall, 2010 WL 56181, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 5, 2010). This Court need not
resolve that question, because jurisdiction is proper under § 1965(b).

1 [REDACTED]¹³ Fenix did not merely serve California users; it
2 maintained an operational footprint that included:

3

- 4 • Over 100 associated personnel in California. FAC ¶ 41.
- 5 • Co-branded promotional events with at least one Agency Defendant
6 tied to California-based Creator accounts. FAC ¶ 6.

7 In 2023, Defendant Elite Creators LLC (publicly operating as Creators Inc.)
8 publicly co-branded a promotional campaign with OnlyFans, which featured
9 California-based Creators modeling OnlyFans-branded swimsuits on a runway
10 backed by signage bearing the logos of both companies. FAC ¶ 6. The campaign
11 was promoted through the Instagram account @ofmerch, which links directly to
12 Defendants' online store. While the event took place in Florida, the collaboration
13 was driven by a California agency and centered on California-based Creators—
14 further illustrating the state's centrality to Fenix's marketing strategy. These
15 contacts underscore the systematic nature of Fenix's integration with the California
16 market. At a minimum, they warrant additional jurisdictional discovery.

17

6. Venue is proper as to Plaintiff R.M.

18 Fenix argues that claims by Plaintiff R.M. should be transferred to Delaware
19 under the forum-selection clause in OnlyFans' Terms of Service. But the Court has
20 already rejected that argument in prior briefing. *See* Dkt. 117 at 2–3. The forum-
21 selection clause in question is not enforceable against Plaintiffs asserting claims
22 based on deception, and public policy weighs against transfer where the gravamen
23 of the action is fraud. *See Doe v. Match Group*, 2022 WL 4551660, at 6 (C.D. Cal.
24 Aug. 12, 2022). R.M. resides in California, and the claims he asserts arise from
25

26

27

28 ¹³ Carey Decl., Ex. A, at Resp. No. 4.

1 deceptive conduct orchestrated by a California-facing platform. Venue is proper
2 under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

3 **B. Plaintiffs did not consent—either explicitly or implicitly—to the Chatter
4 Scams.**

5 Fenix repeatedly argues that Plaintiffs consent to the communications at
6 issue, suggesting that Plaintiffs simply misunderstood the transactional nature of
7 “fantasy” chats. Motion at 1, 13–15. But that framing distorts both the law and the
8 nature of Plaintiffs’ allegations. Plaintiffs do not allege they were misled about
9 the *type* of content being offered—they allege they were lied to about *who* they
10 were interacting with. And as the FAC very specifically alleges, OnlyFans builds its
11 business on that distinction. The platform markets itself as offering “direct
12 communication” and “authentic connection” with creators—not anonymous adult
13 content. FAC ¶¶ 6, 8, 13, 109. The creator’s identity is the central feature of the
14 offering. This is not about access to media. It is about access to a *person*. As one
15 misled fan quoted in the FAC asked: “Why would anyone go on OnlyFans in the
16 first place, when you can get content almost anywhere (free in most cases)?” FAC ¶
17 79. His answer is telling: “The opportunity to Direct Message the Creator you are
18 subscribed to.” *Id.* In other words, the emotional (and thus economic) value of the
19 exchange depends entirely on its authenticity.

20 The Fenix Defendants exploit that illusion to turn emotionally intimate
21 conversations into a revenue stream, while concealing that the person on the other
22 end is not the Creator at all—but a stranger paid to mimic them.¹⁴ That is not

23
24
25
26 ¹⁴ As the FAC alleges, these chatters are often low-wage workers in developing
27 countries, hired to impersonate creators at scale, and the Agencies are paying the
28 \$3-\$4 an hour. FAC ¶¶ 105–110. These workers are expected to “learn as much

1 “fantasy”—that is fraud. And even if some users today may approach OnlyFans as
2 a platform for fantasy engagement, that is both factually disputed and legally
3 irrelevant at the pleadings stage. As the FAC makes clear, the relevant conduct
4 began during the platform’s explosive growth in the COVID era—when OnlyFans
5 aggressively marketed itself as a vehicle for real-time, personal connection. FAC ¶¶
6 6, 8, 13, 109. Whether that promise has since eroded, or been reinterpreted by some
7 users, is a factual dispute inappropriate for resolution on a motion to dismiss.

9 Regardless, consent obtained through deception is no consent at all. *See, e.g.*,
10 *In re Vizio, Inc., Consumer Privacy Litig.*, 238 F. Supp. 3d 1204, 1233 (C.D. Cal.
11 2017) (burying the opt-out provision in obscure settings menu or making the “off”
12 function non-operational deprived consumers of ability to consent); *Opperman v.*
13 *Path, Inc.*, 84 F. Supp. 3d 962, 990–91 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (finding that allowing a
14 app to use “find friends” feature did not consent to having contacts used in other,
15 unauthorized ways). Plaintiffs allege they believed they were interacting with
16 specific, real creators, and were never informed otherwise. FAC ¶¶ 3, 250–258,
17 263–275. Fenix concealed the Chatter Scams because they knew disclosure would
18 disrupt payment. FAC ¶¶ 127–128, 140, 160–163. That is deception about the core
19 nature of the transaction. Fenix’s attempt to recast the Chatter Scams as “fantasy” is
20 not a legal defense—it’s part of the scheme.

21
22
23
24
25
26 about the Creator they will be impersonating and convince the Users they are
27 communicating with the Creator directly. FAC ¶¶ 109–117. They are also trained
28 to exploit users’ emotional vulnerability drive more purchases. FAC ¶¶ 2, 16, 46,
110–112.

1 **C. Section 230 Does Not Bar Plaintiffs' Claims.**

2 The Fenix Defendants incorrectly attempt to claim Section 230 bars Plaintiffs'
3 claims. Section 230 precludes liability for (1) internet service providers (2) whom a
4 plaintiff seeks to treat as a publisher or speaker (3) of information provided by a third-
5 party. *Barnes v. Yahoo!, Inc.*, 570 F.3d 1096, 1100-01 (9th Cir. 2009). Fenix fails to
6 meet the standard for both the second and third prongs of the test—Plaintiffs' claims
7 do not seek to treat OnlyFans as a publisher, nor do the claims relate to information
8 provided by third-parties.

9
10 The Fenix Defendants' half-hearted argument ignores both (a) the bulk of the
11 allegations in the FAC that describe their violative conduct, and (b) relevant case law
12 that makes clear Section 230 has no application to these claims.
13

14 **1. The Fenix Defendants Ignore the Scores of Allegations in the FAC
15 that Detail Their Affirmative Misrepresentations.**

16 The Fenix Defendants' Motion selectively cites the FAC to provide the false
17 narrative that Plaintiffs' claims relate *only* to defendants' failure to "monitor third-
18 party content." (Motion at 9–10.) In reality, the FAC alleges in great detail, how the
19 Fenix Defendants *knew* about the "Chatters Scams" and then *promoted* the fraud for
20 financial gain. *See, e.g.*, FAC ¶¶ 7, 13–14, 17–18, 62, 64–100, 112, 115–171, 250–
21 323, 361–446, 449–451, 453–464, 467, 469–473, 482, 497–546. Fenix also ignores
22 dozens of examples in the FAC detailing their direct public misrepresentations—
23 many drawn from Fenix's own social media posts. *See* FAC ¶¶ 91, 384–404 (*e.g.*,
24 standardized marketing claims about direct messaging and 1-on-1 chats); *see also*
25 *infra* Section III.C.1 (citing specific examples).
26
27
28

1 These allegations make clear that the claims against the Fenix Defendants arise
2 from their own direct statements and conduct rather than management of third-party
3 content published on their website.

4 **2. Section 230 does not apply to Fenix's Own Statements and
5 Conduct.**

6 Plaintiffs' claims do not treat OnlyFans as a publisher. The Ninth Circuit has
7 articulated the standard for treatment as a "publisher," which occurs when the
8 claims relate to the website "reviewing, editing, and deciding whether to publish or
9 to withdraw from publication third-party content." *Barnes*, 570 F.3d at 1102. Here,
10 Plaintiffs' claims arise out of the Fenix Defendants' direct statements and
11 marketing efforts—not whether they published or withdrew third-party content
12 from their website.

14 Plaintiffs' claims against the Fenix Defendants also do not target information
15 provided by a third-party. Rather the allegations refer to statements made and
16 marketing strategies implemented directly by OnlyFans. Section 230 has no
17 applicability to statements made by Fenix. *Calise v. Meta Platforms, Inc.*, 103 F.4th
18 732, 744 (9th Cir. 2024) (Section 230 doesn't apply when "Plaintiffs' claims seek
19 to treat [the defendant] as the publisher or speaker of its own content—or content
20 that it created or developed in whole or in part—rather than the publisher or speaker
21 of entirely third-party content").

23 Section 230 provides no immunity to websites when the claims relate to the
24 companies' own statements. This point is axiomatic. Indeed, the sole case cited by
25 the Fenix Defendants related to their Section 230 argument supports this point.
26 Motion at 9–10 (citing *Doe v. Grindr Inc.*, 128 F.4th 1148, 1152-53 (9th Cir.
27 2025)); *see also id.* at 1151 ("defendant loses its immunity" when the cause of
28

1 action “seeks to treat the defendant as the publisher or speaker of its *own* content”)
2 (quotations and citation omitted) (emphasis in original).

3 The facts in *Grindr* are wholly distinguishable from the allegations in the FAC.
4 The claims alleged by the *Grindr* plaintiff involved defective design and negligence
5 related to the website’s operation. Each of the claims arose out of third-party content
6 posted on the website, which “necessarily implicate[d] Grindr’s roles as a publisher
7 of third-party content.” *Id.* at 1152. Plaintiffs’ claims against the Fenix Defendants,
8 conversely, allege the company engaged in fraudulent conduct, breached contractual
9 obligations, and violated a variety of federal and state claims by knowingly
10 promoting the Chatter Scams to unsuspecting Fans for the purpose of financial gain.
11 Section 230 provides no immunity for the Fenix Defendants.
12

13 **D. Plaintiffs Have Plausibly Alleged a Breach of Contract by the Fenix
Defendants.**

14 To state a claim for breach of contract under California law, a plaintiff must
15 allege: (1) the existence of a contract; (2) the plaintiff’s performance or excuse for
16 nonperformance; (3) the defendant’s breach; and (4) resulting damages. *Oasis W.*
17 *Realty, LLC v. Goldman*, 51 Cal. App. 5th 811, 825 (2020).

18 Fenix promised Plaintiffs that they would be able to send direct messages to
19 the Creators they subscribed to. Before a user can purchase a subscription, the
20 platform explicitly represents: “*Direct message with your favorite Creator.*” FAC
21 ¶¶ 3, 79, 87–92, 109. That is not background marketing. It is the core promise at the
22 point of sale. Courts have recognized that when a platform uses clear, forward-
23 looking language to induce a transaction, that language may constitute a binding
24 contractual term. *See Brown v. Google LLC*, 685 F. Supp. 3d 909, 931 (N.D. Cal.
25
26
27
28

1 2023) (“‘Will’ and ‘will not’ language supports a reasonable inference that Google
2 made a binding promise.”).

3 Plaintiffs accepted that offer when they subscribed, paid for content, and
4 relied on the representation that they would be communicating directly with
5 Creators. FAC ¶¶ 250–278, 497–504. But instead of fulfilling that promise, Fenix
6 knowingly permitted Agencies to replace Creators with Chatters—offshore workers
7 paid to impersonate Creators in private message threads. FAC ¶¶ 122–139, 144–
8 149, 500. These were not isolated violations. The FAC alleges that impersonation
9 occurred at scale, driven by operations Fenix enabled and profited from. FAC ¶¶
10 157–158. Plaintiffs paid for direct communication. What they got was a monetized
11 lie.

12 Fenix’s Terms of Service reinforce this understanding. The Terms prohibit
13 impersonation, restrict account access to verified Creators, and reserve to Fenix the
14 unilateral power to suspend or remove accounts that violate these rules. FAC ¶¶
15 153–156. These Terms were not passive disclaimers. They were contractual
16 controls—and Fenix was the only party with the authority to enforce them. *See Doe*
17 *v. Roblox Corp.*, 602 F. Supp. 3d 1243, 1252 (N.D. Cal. 2022) (allowing breach
18 claim where platform failed to enforce its own safety rules); *Est. of Bride v. YOLO*
19 *Techs., Inc.*, 112 F.4th 1168, 1176 (9th Cir. 2024) (§ 230 does not shield platforms
20 from liability for refusing to enforce their own Terms).

21 Fenix argues that Plaintiffs’ claims are barred by contractual disclaimers or
22 by § 230. *See* Motion at 9–10, 17–18. Neither defense applies. Plaintiffs identify
23 specific contractual promises—onboarding language and Terms-based enforcement
24 provisions—and allege that Fenix knowingly permitted those promises to be

1 violated. A platform cannot tell users they are paying to message a specific Creator,
2 and then look the other way when impersonation drives profits. That is a breach of
3 contract, not a failure to moderate content. *See Barnes v. Yahoo!*, 570 F.3d 1096,
4 1105 (9th Cir. 2009) (“Contract liability here would come not from Yahoo!’s
5 publishing conduct, but from its manifest intention to be legally obligated to do
6 something.”); *Calise v. Meta Platforms, Inc.*, 103 F.4th 732, 741–42 (9th Cir. 2024)
7 (contract-based obligations fall outside § 230).

8 Fenix also claims that impersonation was “implausible” because Chatters
9 operated outside the official OnlyFans interface. Motion at 9. But the FAC alleges
10 that Fenix had full visibility into these violations, including irregular IP logins, chat
11 volume anomalies, and metadata patterns associated with Agency-run accounts.
12 FAC ¶¶ 138–149. At the pleading stage, these facts are more than sufficient to
13 support a reasonable inference that Fenix knew the promise it made was being
14 broken—and chose not to stop it.

15 The FAC alleges a clear contractual promise, knowing breach, and resulting
16 financial harm. Fenix told users they were paying to message Creators. It knew they
17 were not—and profited anyway. That is enough to state a claim.

18 **E. Plaintiffs Allege a Colorable RICO and RICO Conspiracy Claim
19 Against the Fenix Defendants**

20 A civil RICO claim requires four elements: (1) conduct (2) of an enterprise
21 affecting interstate commerce (3) through a pattern (4) of racketeering activity.
22 *Eclectic Props. E., LLC v. Marcus & Millichap Co.*, 751 F.3d 990, 997 (9th Cir.
23 2014). To plead a RICO conspiracy under § 1962(d), Plaintiffs must plausibly
24 allege that each defendant “was aware of the essential nature and scope of the
25 enterprise and intended to participate in it.” *Howard v. Am. Online Inc.*, 208 F.3d
26 208 (9th Cir. 2000).

1 741, 751 (9th Cir. 2000). Courts must construe the statute “liberally... to effectuate
2 its remedial purposes.” *Odom v. Microsoft Corp.*, 486 F.3d 541, 547 (9th Cir. 2007)
3 (en banc) (quoting *Sedima, S.P.R.L. v. Imrex Co.*, 473 U.S. 479, 498 (1985)).
4

5 The Fenix Defendants argue that Plaintiffs’ RICO claim is “devoid” of facts
6 showing intent to defraud, but the FAC alleges—with detail and specificity—a
7 coordinated, monetized deception that could not function without Fenix’s
8 participation. Motion at 11. Indeed, Fenix’s design choices, revenue share, and
9 marketing language not only support a strong inference of intent to defraud, but
10 demonstrate that OnlyFans was engineered to enable this precise scheme.
11

12 Fenix’s RICO liability is also not derivative or secondary. The FAC alleges:
13

- 14 • Fenix knew about and collaborated with agencies perpetrating the Chatter
15 Scams, including through co-hosted promotional events. FAC ¶ 6.
- 16 • Fenix’s business model centers on the promise of “authentic” one-on-one
17 communication between Fans and Creators—a promise it knew was
18 systematically false. FAC ¶¶ 13–15, 87, 91.
- 19 • Fenix actively markets these “direct” and “1-on-1” connections in
20 standardized language across every Creator profile, on its homepage, and in
21 branded social media posts. FAC ¶¶ 14, 91, 384–404.
- 22 • Fenix maintains platform tools that allow third-party Chatters to impersonate
23 Creators at scale, while simultaneously concealing their involvement. FAC
24 ¶¶ 17, 112–113, 120–127.
- 25 • Fenix profits directly from this impersonation: it takes 20% of every dollar
26 extracted from Fans under the false pretense of real connection. FAC ¶ 62.
27

1 • Fenix’s internal data and system access made it uniquely positioned to detect
2 (and prevent) the use of Chatters. It chose not to do so. FAC ¶¶ 133–136.
3 Fenix’s defense—that these allegations amount to mere omissions or passive
4 indifference—mischaracterizes the FAC. Plaintiffs allege an affirmative scheme to
5 defraud, sustained and scaled through coordinated conduct. That scheme includes
6 misrepresentations in marketing copy, a deceptive user interface, and a revenue-
7 sharing structure that incentivizes the very impersonation Fenix publicly disclaims.
8 FAC ¶¶ 14, 384–404.

9
10 At the pleading stage, intent to defraud may be inferred from the structure of
11 the scheme itself. *See Carey v. J.A.K.’s Puppies, Inc.*, 763 F. Supp. 3d 952, 983
12 (C.D. Cal. 2025) (“A plaintiff may establish the intent element of mail or wire fraud
13 by alleging the existence of a scheme which was reasonably calculated to deceive
14 persons of ordinary prudence.”); *United States v. Rogers*, 321 F.3d 1226, 1230 (9th
15 Cir. 2003) (intent to defraud may be inferred from concealment); *Sun Sav. & Loan
16 Ass’n v. Dierdorff*, 825 F.2d 187, 195 (9th Cir. 1987) (intent “clearly conveyed ‘by
17 implication’” where scheme involved structural deception).
18
19

20 Finally, Fenix’s argument that it is merely “facilitating communications
21 among users” cannot be squared with the facts alleged. Motion at 9. This is not a
22 neutral platform. Fenix designed and marketed OnlyFans as a vehicle for
23 personalized intimacy, while quietly enabling and profiting from systematic
24 impersonation. That is a RICO scheme—and Plaintiffs have plausibly alleged
25 Fenix’s knowing and intentional role in it.
26
27

28 Accordingly, Fenix’s motion to dismiss Plaintiffs’ RICO and RICO
conspiracy claims should be denied.

1 **F. Plaintiffs plausibly allege that Fenix committed fraud and actively
2 concealed the Chatter Scams.**

3 Under California law, a claim for fraud requires: (1) a misrepresentation or
4 concealment of a material fact; (2) knowledge of falsity; (3) intent to induce
5 reliance; (4) justifiable reliance; and (5) resulting damage. *Lazar v. Superior Ct.*, 12
6 Cal. 4th 631, 638 (1996). Fraudulent concealment, a subspecies of fraud, arises
7 when the defendant suppresses or omits a material fact with the intent to
8 deceive. *Boschma v. Home Loan Ctr., Inc.*, 198 Cal. App. 4th 230, 248 (2011).
9 Claims based on concealment must also show that the defendant had a duty to
10 disclose the withheld information. *LiMandri v. Judkins*, 52 Cal. App. 4th 326, 336
11 (1997).

12 Plaintiffs allege each of these elements with specificity. They do not claim
13 they are disappointed with the emotional tone of the messages they received. They
14 claim they were deceived about who was sending them—and that Defendants lied
15 about that identity to drive revenue.

16 The FAC alleges that OnlyFans markets itself as a platform for authentic,
17 direct communication—not generic adult content, but real interaction with a
18 specific person. whose identity is the core of the transaction. FAC ¶¶ 3, 6, 8, 13, 79,
19 109. The Fenix Defendants know that the entire platform is built to reinforce that
20 illusion of personal access—and deliberately conceal the Chatter Scams that
21 undermine it.

22 The FAC details how the Chatter Scams replace real creators with paid
23 impersonators: offshore workers trained to mimic a creator's voice, escalate
24 intimacy, and monetize emotional connection. FAC ¶¶ 131–136, 151–156. Fenix
25 does not merely tolerate this scheme—it facilitates and profits from it. Fenix

1 provides tools to help Agencies manage impersonation at scale, selectively enforces
2 its TOS to shield high-revenue impersonators, and structures incentives around the
3 paid messaging that make emotional fraud the most profitable use of the platform.
4 FAC ¶¶ 134–138, 140–145, 160–163.
5

6 This is textbook fraud. Fenix conceals the truth to induce payment. Plaintiffs
7 reasonably relied on the platform’s promise of direct connection, sending money
8 under false pretenses sustained by deliberate concealment. FAC ¶¶ 3, 8, 126, 144.
9 Fenix makes sure the messages appear to come from the Creator and do not
10 disclose that Chatters are operating behind the scenes. They design the product so
11 that deception looks like authenticity.
12

13 The resulting harm is both economic and emotional. Plaintiffs lose money in
14 direct payments. They are manipulated into sharing personal, intimate
15 communications with strangers. FAC ¶¶ 8, 109, 120, 126. Fenix asks the Court to
16 treat this as a subjective disappointment. *See* Motion at 8–9 (arguing allegations are
17 implausible because Chatters “never opened the official OnlyFans interface” and
18 Fenix lacked specific knowledge). But the allegations describe an objective scheme
19 to extract money by lying about the nature of the service. *See Mendoza v.*
20 *Amalgamated Transit Union Int’l*, 30 F.4th 879, 889 (9th Cir. 2022) (“Intent to
21 defraud can be inferred from the totality of the circumstances.”); *In re JUUL Labs,*
22 *Inc., Mktg., Sales Pracs. & Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 497 F. Supp. 3d 552, 634 (N.D. Cal.
23 2020) (“The allegations are detailed and plausible—and that is all that Rule 8
24 requires.”).¹⁵
25

26
27 ¹⁵ To the extent Rule 9(b) applies, Plaintiffs satisfy its particularity requirement.
28 Courts in the Ninth Circuit apply a somewhat relaxed standard in fraudulent

1 Fenix tries to avoid the weight of these allegations by calling the entire
2 scheme “implausible.” But that objection fails. Fenix argues that Plaintiffs’ claims
3 are implausible because Plaintiffs have no way to know what Fenix knows. *See*
4 Motion at 9–10. But the FAC includes detailed allegations describing Fenix’s role
5 in designing, incentivizing, and profiting from the Chatter Scams. *See* FAC ¶¶ 134–
6 138, 140–145, 160–163. Plaintiffs do not rely on vague speculation—they describe
7 internal analytics tools, compensation structures, moderation policies, and selective
8 enforcement practices that support a strong inference of knowledge. *Id.* Courts
9 routinely find fraud plausible where defendants benefit from the deception and
10 control the architecture enabling it. *See, e.g., In re Apple & AT&T iPad Unlimited*
11 *Data Plan Litig.*, 802 F. Supp. 2d 1070, 1076 (N.D. Cal. 2011) (inferring
12 knowledge from defendant’s internal control over allegedly deceptive systems).
13 Fenix also cites *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662 (2009), but that case involved a
14 bare legal conclusion—not detailed factual allegations like those in the FAC.
15 Fenix’s objection fails on its own terms.

16 **G. Plaintiffs plausibly allege deceit under California Civil Code § 1709.**

17 California Civil Code § 1709 imposes liability on “[o]ne who willfully
18 deceives another with intent to induce him to alter his position to his injury or risk.”

19 concealment cases, especially where the relevant facts are in the defendant’s
20 exclusive possession. *See, e.g., In re Apple & AT&T iPad Unlimited Data Plan*
21 *Litig.*, 802 F. Supp. 2d 1070, 1075 (N.D. Cal. 2011); *Poston v. Gen. Motors, LLC*,
22 2024 WL 3558377, at *5 (S.D. Cal. July 22, 2024). Here, Plaintiffs identify the
23 concealed fact (the use of paid Chatters to impersonate Creators), explain where
24 disclosure would have been appropriate (e.g., during onboarding and
25 communications), and allege the systems Fenix used to support and profit from that
26 concealment. These allegations are more than sufficient to provide Fenix with
27 notice and allow it to prepare a defense.

1 Cal. Civ. Code § 1709. This includes affirmative misrepresentations as well as
2 deceptive omissions. *Lovejoy v. AT&T Corp.*, 92 Cal. App. 4th 85, 93 (2001).
3 Deceit under § 1709 requires the same elements as common-law fraud:
4 misrepresentation or concealment of a material fact, knowledge of falsity, intent to
5 induce reliance, actual reliance, and resulting harm. *Lazar*, 12 Cal. 4th
6 638; *Graham v. Bank of Am., N.A.*, 226 Cal. App. 4th 594, 606 (2014).

7 Plaintiffs plead exactly that. Fenix knowingly deceives users about a material
8 fact—the identity of the person they are interacting with—in order to induce
9 payment. That deception causes economic and emotional harm.

10 As the FAC alleges, the central promise of the OnlyFans platform is direct
11 communication with specific Creators. FAC ¶¶ 6, 8, 13, 109. Defendants know that
12 promise drives user engagement and revenue. They also know it is false. Through
13 the Chatter Scams, paid impersonators—Chatters trained to mimic a Creator’s
14 voice, escalate emotional intimacy, and conceal their true identity—solicit
15 payments from Fans in a process they refer to as “farming.” FAC ¶¶ 16–17, 119,
16 131–134, 151–156.

17 This is not passive inaccuracy. It is willful deceit. Fenix builds and profits from a
18 system designed to create the illusion of real connection while hiding the
19 impersonation behind it. FAC ¶¶ 134–138, 140–145, 160–163. Users pay because
20 they believe the interactions are real. Fenix structures the platform to reinforce that
21 belief—and to prevent them from discovering the truth. FAC ¶¶ 126, 144. That is
22 the definition of deceit: a deliberate lie about a material fact, made to induce action,
23 resulting in harm. The statute requires no more. Plaintiffs plead exactly what § 1709
24 prohibits.

1 **H. Plaintiffs sufficiently plead their VPPA claim.**

2 The VPPA prohibits video service providers from disclosing PII that links
3 consumers to specific content, except in narrow circumstances. 18 U.S.C. § 2710.
4 Plaintiffs plausibly allege each required element: the Fenix Defendants are
5 providers, Plaintiffs are consumers, the Fenix Defendants disclosed PII, and the
6 disclosures were not made in the ordinary course. *See Eichenberger v. ESPN, Inc.*,
7 876 F.3d 979, 984–86 (9th Cir. 2017). Each of these elements is satisfied here. The
8 FAC alleges that agency-run accounts monetized access to private audiovisual
9 content; that Plaintiffs paid for and viewed that content through those accounts; and
10 that the Fenix Defendants disclosed user-specific viewing histories to overseas
11 Chatters hired to impersonate Creators and maximize revenue from video sales.
12 FAC ¶¶ 112, 449–452.

13 Fenix’s contrary arguments mischaracterize the FAC and ignore controlling
14 authority. This is not a passive analytics case like *Hulu*, where disclosures occurred
15 through automated tracking pixels. The FAC alleges direct, user-specific
16 disclosures made to third-party impersonators for the express purpose of
17 monetizing emotional intimacy and video consumption.

18 **1. Defendants qualify as video tape service providers because they
19 delivered audiovisual content as a core monetized feature of the
20 platform.**

21 The VPPA defines “video tape service provider” as “any person engaged in
22 the business, in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, of rental, sale, or
23 delivery of prerecorded video cassette tapes or similar audiovisual materials.” 18
24 U.S.C. § 2710(a)(4). Courts interpret this definition to cover entities whose
25 commercial model involves the distribution of video content as a central feature.
26
27

See In re Vizio, Inc., 238 F. Supp. 3d 1204, 1221 (C.D. Cal. 2017); *In re Hulu Privacy Litig.*, 86 F. Supp. 3d 1090, 1095 (N.D. Cal. 2015).

The FAC alleges that Agency Defendants—including Moxy, Unruly, Behave, and Content X—controlled the Creator accounts through which Plaintiffs accessed and purchased video content. FAC ¶ 112 (alleging agencies “operated” Creator pages and delivered video content through those pages). Agencies profited directly from monetized video content delivered through PPV unlocks, tips, and custom transactions. FAC ¶¶ 222–225 (detailing agency-controlled pricing and delivery structures); FAC ¶ 452 (alleging that video delivery occurred through agency-controlled channels).

Fenix argues that the agencies are not “video tape service providers” because they merely staffed accounts and did not themselves “deliver” video content. Motion at 11. But the FAC alleges that agencies directed content production, scheduled video drops, and responded to User video requests via chat interfaces. FAC ¶¶ 452–454 (alleging chatters handled distribution of paid videos under agency instruction). At the pleading stage, Plaintiffs need not prove that agencies themselves uploaded video files; it is enough that they orchestrated the delivery and monetization of audiovisual materials as part of their commercial model. *See In re Vizio*, 238 F. Supp. 3d at 1221.

2. Plaintiffs qualify as consumers because they subscribed to and paid for video services operated by Defendants.

The VPPA protects “subscribers” of goods or services from video tape service providers. 18 U.S.C. § 2710(a)(1). Courts interpret the term to include individuals who pay to access video content, regardless of whether they interact

1 directly with the content host. *See Ellis v. Cartoon Network, Inc.*, 803 F.3d 1251,
2 1256 (11th Cir. 2015).

3 The FAC alleges that Plaintiffs subscribed to Creator accounts and paid to
4 access PPV videos, many of which were sent through chat and message-based
5 unlocks. FAC ¶¶ 112, 268, 447–462. These payments constituted a subscription to
6 audiovisual services offered by the agencies, regardless of whether those agencies
7 were identified on the front end. FAC ¶ 452 (alleging Plaintiffs interacted with
8 agency-controlled accounts in connection with video content).

9 Fenix argues that Plaintiffs subscribed to OnlyFans or to individual Creators,
10 not to the agencies themselves. Motion at 11. But the FAC alleges that the agencies
11 operated the accounts, directed the video transactions, and received the proceeds.
12 FAC ¶¶ 112, 454–455. Under the VPPA, this is sufficient to establish that Plaintiffs
13 were “subscribers” of Fenix’s video services.

14 **3. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants Disclosed Personally Identifiable
15 Information.**

16 The VPPA defines PII to include “information which identifies a person as
17 having requested or obtained specific video materials or services.” 18 U.S.C. §
18 2710(a)(3). The Ninth Circuit applies a common-sense standard: information
19 qualifies as PII if it would “readily permit an ordinary person to identify a specific
20 individual’s video-watching behavior.” *Eichenberger v. ESPN, Inc.*, 876 F.3d 979,
21 985 (9th Cir. 2017).

22 The Fenix Defendants lean on *Eichenberger* to suggest that usernames or
23 account handles are inherently anonymous. Motion at 12–13. But this District
24 recently rejected that argument in a case squarely on point. In *Archer v.*
25 *NBCUniversal Media, LLC*, No. 2:24-CV-10744-AB-JC, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS
26

1 129598, at *11 (C.D. Cal. July 2, 2025), the court held that the transmission of
2 Facebook IDs ("FIDs") and video URLs to a third party was enough to plead a
3 VPPA violation. In denying the defendants' motion to dismiss, the court explicitly
4 rejected arguments that plaintiffs had not alleged "the disclosure of [PII]." *Id.* at *7.
5 Despite the fact that FIDs are platform-specific identifiers that do not necessarily
6 reveal users' real-life identities, the court found that when combined with viewing
7 behavior, FIDs were precisely the type of information that satisfies the VPPA's PII
8 standard. *Id.* at *11–12. Thus, the court held, "Defendants disclosed Plaintiffs' PII
9 by transmitting a combination of Plaintiffs' FIDs—identifying Plaintiffs; and video
10 titles and URLs—revealing the video materials obtained or requested by Plaintiffs."
11 *Id.* at *11.
12

13 That is exactly what Plaintiffs allege here. The FAC describes how Fenix
14 combines Fan identifiers—such as usernames, account handles, and chat history—
15 with video purchase behavior to simulate continuity and familiarity. FAC ¶¶ 144,
16 222–225, 449–456. These individual identifiers are shared with Chatters and used
17 to manipulate those same individual Fans into buying more videos. A Fan's
18 username is not isolated metadata; it is part of a deliberately cultivated record of
19 what that user has viewed and how they've interacted. The only reason the scam
20 works is because the user is recognizable from prior context.
21

22 That puts this case squarely within *Archer*. Indeed, in many respects
23 Plaintiffs' allegations provide even stronger support for their VPPA claim. The
24 disclosures here are not backend transmissions to analytics partners. They are
25 targeted, profit-driven disclosures that weaponize private viewing behavior for
26 emotional manipulation—precisely the kind of harm Congress intended to prevent.
27

1 As the Ninth Circuit has recognized, the VPPA was designed not just to avoid
2 embarrassment, but “to ensure that consumers retain control over their personal
3 information.” *Eichenberger*, 876 F.3d at 984; *see also* FAC ¶ 447 (citing legislative
4 history). *See also* *In re Facebook, Inc.*, 402 F. Supp. 3d 767, 798 (N.D. Cal. 2019)
5 (PII includes “identifiers tied to video behavior”). The allegation of deliberate,
6 revenue-generating use of user + video data puts this far closer to the heartland of
7 VPPA violations than passive analytics cases like *Hulu*.
8

9 The Ninth Circuit recently reaffirmed the VPPA’s reach in *Calise v. Meta*
10 *Platforms, Inc.*, 103 F.4th 732 (9th Cir. 2024), holding that even partial identifiers
11 combined with viewing behavior are sufficient to constitute PII. There, as here, the
12 defendants argued that user-facing identifiers were too attenuated to trigger
13 liability. The court rejected that view, emphasizing that the VPPA protects against
14 disclosures that connect users to specific video behavior, even if the identifiers are
15 platform-specific. The allegations here go further: Plaintiffs describe the deliberate
16 use of Fan-specific viewing histories to target emotionally vulnerable users and
17 exploit them for profit. That is not metadata. It is manipulation.
18

19 **4. These disclosures were made to unauthorized third parties, outside
20 the ordinary course of business.**

21 The VPPA prohibits disclosure of PII “to any person” unless the disclosure
22 falls within a narrow statutory exception—such as those made “in the ordinary
23 course of business.” 18 U.S.C. § 2710(b)(2)(D). That phrase is defined to cover
24 only “debt collection, order fulfillment, request processing, or the transfer of
25 ownership.” 18 U.S.C. § 2710(a)(2). Courts construe this carveout narrowly to
26 prevent it from swallowing the rule. *See In re Hulu Privacy Litig.*, 86 F. Supp. 3d
27 1090, 1095 (N.D. Cal. 2015).
28

1 The FAC alleges that Fenix and its agency partners disclosed user-specific
2 viewing histories to offshore Chatters. FAC ¶¶ 122, 226–227, 449–452. These
3 Chatters were third parties, not disclosed to Plaintiffs, and not essential to platform
4 operations. Their access to Fans’ viewing data was not incidental—it was the
5 mechanism by which they targeted emotionally invested users and manipulated
6 them into further purchases. FAC ¶¶ 450–456.

8 This conduct falls outside the narrow ordinary-course safe harbor. In *Archer*
9 *v. NBCUniversal Media, LLC*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 129598, at *14 (C.D. Cal.
10 July 2, 2025), this District held that transmitting user identifiers and video URLs to
11 Meta was not “ordinary course” conduct, even though the transmission occurred
12 through standard website infrastructure. Here, the disclosures were even more
13 deliberate: Chatters were given tailored access to video records for the express
14 purpose of simulating human connection and driving purchases.

16 That is not billing, request processing, or technical administration. It is
17 monetized deception carried out through undisclosed third-party agents—exactly
18 the kind of exploitative disclosure the VPPA was enacted to prevent.

19 **I. Fenix’s Violation of CIPA is Clear.**

21 Relying almost entirely on the Moxy Defendant’s motion,¹⁶ Fenix’s only
22 unique argument is that they could not have violated CIPA because the OnlyFans
23 Terms of Service and Privacy Policy were sufficient to put Fans on notice that

25
26
27

¹⁶ Plaintiffs reincorporate by reference here their response to the Agency
28 Defendants’ motion for Rule 12(b)(6) dismissal with respect to the CIPA and
Wiretap Act claims.

1 Chatter interception was occurring on its platform. Motion 121 at 13–15. This is
2 hard to take seriously.

3 **1. The OnlyFans Terms of Service and Privacy Policy Do Not
4 Disclose the Actual Interception Scheme.**

5 To start, there is nothing in the OnlyFans Terms of Service or its Privacy
6 Policy that discloses to Fans their messages with Creators—which OnlyFans
7 represented to be occurring “directly” between Fans and Creators—were actually
8 being intercepted by a CRM software and re-routed to an entirely separate platform,
9 where Chatters in another country were the ones responding to Fan messages. Just
10 the opposite: the Terms prohibit impersonation, restrict account access to verified
11 Creators, and reserve to Fenix the unilateral power to suspend or remove accounts
12 that violate these rules. FAC ¶¶ 153–156.

14 Notably, Fenix only claims that its Terms of Service and Privacy Policy
15 alerted Fans to the fact that its platform would “process ‘customer data’ . . . like
16 ‘chat messages . . .’”; “moderate . . . ‘content sent in chat messages’”; and “share
17 personal data” with “third-party service providers. . . .” Motion 121 at 14. This is
18 entirely different from notifying Fans that a third party managing the *Creators*—
19 *i.e.*, the Agency Defendants—was enlisting the help of another third party—CRM
20 providers—to simultaneously intercept and re-route every single message that Fans
21 sent certain Creators from the OnlyFans platform to an entirely separate software
22 application. Moreover, the Terms of Service and Privacy Policy provide no notice
23 that once the messages were re-routed, Chatters (not Creators) were the ones
24 responding to Fan messages. (FAC at ¶¶ 490–493.)

27
28

2. Consent is a Fact-Intensive Inquiry and is Otherwise Inapplicable.

More fundamentally, “the question of express consent is usually a question of fact, where a fact-finder needs to interpret the express terms of any agreements to determine whether these agreements *adequately notify* individuals regarding the interceptions.” *In re Google Inc. Gmail Litig.*, 2014 WL 1102660, at *15 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2014) (emphasis added). Likewise, implied consent is “an intensely factual question that requires consideration of the circumstances surrounding the interception to divine whether the party whose communication was intercepted was on notice.” *Id.* (citing *Watkins v. L.M. Berry & Co.*, 704 F.2d 577, 582 (11th Cir.1983) (“Consent under Title III is not to be cavalierly implied. . . . It is the task of the trier of fact to determine the scope of the consent and to decide whether and to what extent the interception exceeded that consent.”)). Any suggestion that Plaintiffs consented to the *actual* manner and form of interception that occurred here is, therefore, a fact intensive inquiry not ripe for 12(b)(6) adjudication.

Fenix’s argument also fails because “consent is not a defense where the communication is intercepted for the purpose of committing any criminal or tortious act in violation of” state or federal law. *R.C. v. Walgreen Co.*, 733 F. Supp. 3d 876, 901 (C.D. Cal. 2024) (citing *Brown v. Google LLC*, 525 F. Supp. 3d 1049, 1067 (N.D. Cal. 2021)) (internal quotations omitted). In this case, Plaintiffs have plainly alleged their messages were intercepted in furtherance of a RICO scheme premised on violations of 18 U.S.C. § 1343. *Id.* (“To make use of the criminal/tortious intent exception, a plaintiff must plead sufficient facts to support an inference that the offender intercepted the communication for the purpose of a tortious or criminal act that is independent of the intentional act of recording or

1 interception itself.”). This, alone, is sufficient to defeat any consent-related
2 exceptions under CIPA.

3 **3. Plaintiffs Have Adequately Pled Fenix’s “Aiding and Abetting.”**

4 Plaintiffs have also alleged sufficient facts to demonstrate that Fenix “aided,
5 agreed, conspired with, and/or permitted” the Agency Defendants to intercept and
6 use Plaintiffs’ communications “to solicit Premium Content Fees from Plaintiffs
7 and the Class.” FAC ¶ 482. CIPA’s fourth clause creates liability for any party who
8 “aids, agrees with, employs, or conspires with any person . . . to unlawfully do, or
9 permit, or cause to be done any of the acts or things” outlined in CIPA. *See* Cal.
10 Penal Code § 631(a). As alleged in the FAC, Fenix is not only aware of the Agency
11 Defendants’ use of CRM software to intercept Plaintiffs’ messages, but
12 intentionally chooses not to police such activity in order to profit from the increased
13 revenues the CRM-enabled Chatters generate. (FAC ¶¶ 127–128.) This awareness,
14 combined with Fenix’s deliberate inaction and financial benefit from the scheme,
15 establishes the requisite elements for aiding and abetting liability under CIPA’s
16 fourth clause.

17 **J. Plaintiffs adequately plead a CDAFA claim against Fenix.**

18 California’s Comprehensive Computer Data Access and Fraud Act
19 (CDAFA), Cal. Penal Code § 502, prohibits the unauthorized access, use, or
20 copying of computer data, as well as the facilitation of such conduct by others.
21 Plaintiffs allege that Fenix violated multiple provisions of this statute—including
22 §§ 502(c)(2), (c)(3), and (c)(7)—by knowingly facilitating unauthorized access to
23 private Fan communications and monetizing that data for commercial gain.
24
25
26
27
28

1 **1. CDAFA applies to both unauthorized access and misuse of
2 access—no “hacking” is required.**

3 Fenix argues that CDAFA liability arises only if someone bypassed technical
4 barriers. Motion at 15–16. But the statute’s plain text and California law make clear
5 that CDAFA applies to any knowing access or use of computer data “without
6 permission”—including where an actor exceeds the scope of access or uses data for
7 impermissible purposes. *See People v. Childs*, 220 Cal. App. 4th 1079, 1100
8 (2013).

9 Plaintiffs allege that Fenix designed a platform that allowed impersonator
10 Chatters to access Fan inboxes and message histories—without the Fans’
11 knowledge or consent—and use that information to manipulate and monetize
12 emotionally vulnerable users. FAC ¶¶ 122–124, 135–138, 144–148. That suffices to
13 plead “access without permission.”

14 **2. Plaintiffs allege that Fenix violated § 502(c)(2) by enabling the
15 unauthorized copying and use of Fan communications.**

16 Section 502(c)(2) prohibits knowingly accessing and, without permission,
17 “taking, copying, or making use of any data from a computer.” Plaintiffs allege that
18 Fenix knowingly enabled its affiliates and contractors to access and exploit private
19 Fan messages—including photos, videos, and emotional disclosures—in order to
20 impersonate Creators and extract payments. *Id.* Fenix’s systems tracked metadata
21 revealing that accounts were being operated by teams of Chatters, not individual
22 Creators, yet it took no action to restrict access. FAC ¶¶ 145–148, 469–72.

23 **3. Fenix violated § 502(c)(3) by misusing platform services to enable
24 fraud.**

25 Section 502(c)(3) prohibits “[k]nowingly and without permission using or
26 causing to be used any computer services.” Plaintiffs allege that Fenix built API

1 tools and CRM integrations that allowed third-party Chatters to access user
2 communications and simulate Creator intimacy. FAC ¶¶ 122–124, 136, 155–156.
3 These tools were not used to manage accounts—they were used to deceive Fans
4 into paying for premium content and tips, generating revenue of which Fenix took a
5 20% cut.

6 **4. Fenix violated § 502(c)(7) by facilitating the use of private data to
7 extract money.**

8 Section 502(c)(7) prohibits knowingly accessing a computer “in order to
9 wrongfully control or obtain money, property, or data.” Plaintiffs allege that Fenix
10 knowingly allowed third parties to impersonate Creators using Fans’ own data—
11 then took a share of the resulting transactions. FAC ¶¶ 136–138, 145–148, 155–
12 156.

13 **5. Plaintiffs allege concrete economic harm sufficient for CDAFA
14 standing.**

15 Fenix contends that CDAFA standing requires more than “privacy” or
16 “emotional” injury. Motion at 15. But the FAC alleges direct financial losses: Fans
17 paid for subscriptions, tipped impersonators, and purchased premium content
18 because they were deceived into believing they were communicating with the
19 Creator. FAC ¶¶ 255–256, 260, 281, 301, 314. That is more than sufficient to
20 satisfy the statute’s damages requirement at the pleadings stage. *See In re*
21 *Facebook, Inc. Consumer Privacy User Profile Litig.*, 402 F. Supp. 3d 767, 799
22 (N.D. Cal. 2019) (CDAFA covers economic harm tied to unauthorized data use).

23 To the extent the Fenix Defendants argue that Agency conduct is relevant,
24 those arguments are addressed in Plaintiffs’ Consolidated Response in Opposition

25
26
27
28

1 to the Agency Defendants' Motions to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint
2 ("Opp to Agency Defs.' MTD"), filed concurrently with this brief.

3 **K. Plaintiffs Adequately Plead Standing and State a Claim Under All Three
4 UCL Prongs**

5 **1. Plaintiffs have UCL standing based on concrete economic harm.**

6 To establish standing under the UCL, a plaintiff must allege economic injury
7 "as a result of" the defendant's unfair or deceptive conduct. Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code
8 § 17204; *see also* Rutter Guide ¶ 3:167.1. That standard is satisfied here. The FAC
9 alleges that each Plaintiff paid money to subscribe to and interact with what they
10 believed were specific Creators—when in fact they were communicating with
11 Chatters. FAC ¶¶ 81–94.

12 Fenix does not dispute that Plaintiffs paid money. It argues instead that its
13 Terms of Service foreclose any claim of deception or loss. Motion at 10–11. But
14 this is a merits defense, not a standing argument. *See Kwikset Corp. v. Superior
15 Court*, 51 Cal. 4th 310, 327 (2011) ("The question of standing under the UCL... is
16 not whether a plaintiff's claim is meritorious."). Plaintiffs allege that they would
17 not have paid what they did had they known the truth. That is sufficient economic
18 injury under Proposition 64.

19 Because the FAC pleads deceptive conduct, economic harm, and a causal
20 link between the two, Plaintiffs have standing to assert their UCL and FAL claims.

21 **2. Under the UCL's Fraudulent Prong, the FAC adequately alleges a
22 scheme likely to deceive the public.**

23 A business practice is "fraudulent" under the UCL if it is "likely to deceive"
24 members of the public, regardless of whether any individual was actually misled or
25 whether the defendant intended to deceive. *Comm. on Children's Television v. Gen.*
26

1 *Foods Corp.*, 35 Cal. 3d 197, 211 (1983); *Schnall v. Hertz Corp.*, 78 Cal. App. 4th
2 1144, 1167 (2000). A likelihood of deception may arise from affirmative
3 misstatements, misleading implications, or material omissions. *Simeon Mgmt.*
4 *Corp. v. FTC*, 579 F.2d 1137, 1145 (9th Cir. 1978). The relevant question is
5 whether a reasonable consumer would likely be misled. *Moore v. Trader Joe's Co.*,
6 4 F.4th 874, 882 (9th Cir. 2021).

7 Here, the FAC alleges that the Fenix Defendants used uniform user interface
8 labels (e.g., “DM with this user,” “authentic connection”) to falsely suggest that
9 Fans would be communicating directly with the advertised Creator. These
10 representations appear on every Creator profile—not as content supplied by the
11 Creator, but as standardized platform cues embedded by Fenix itself. FAC ¶¶ 81–
12 92, 98–100, 134. Plaintiffs allege that these representations were knowingly false,
13 because Fenix actively enabled and profited from a system in which Agencies used
14 low-wage workers (“Chatters”) to impersonate Creators for financial gain. FAC
15 ¶¶ 112–127, 137–149. Fenix knew about these impersonations, facilitated them
16 through its design choices and policy enforcement decisions, and collected 20% of
17 the proceeds. FAC ¶¶ 7, 9, 130–136, 156–159.

18 Fenix argues that it made no misrepresentations and merely operated a
19 platform where third-party fraud may have occurred. Motion at 10. But that
20 reframing ignores the FAC’s core allegation: that Fenix itself embedded deceptive
21 representations in the interface and withheld material information about who Fans
22 were actually communicating with. Fenix’s role was not passive. The FAC alleges
23 that Fenix knowingly cultivated the illusion of authenticity, monetized that illusion,
24
25
26
27
28

1 and failed to disclose facts that would have disabused consumers of their mistaken
2 belief that they were speaking to Creators.

3 These allegations are more than sufficient under California law, which does
4 not require Plaintiffs to plead intent to deceive, actual deception, or individualized
5 reliance. *Schnall*, 78 Cal. App. 4th at 1167. The standard is whether the platform's
6 practices were likely to mislead reasonable consumers—and the FAC pleads that
7 they were.

9 **3. Under the UCL's Unfair Prong, Plaintiffs state a claim based on
10 systematic impersonation fraud and platform-level exploitation.**

11 A business practice may be “unfair” under the UCL even if it is not deceptive
12 or unlawful. *Cel-Tech Commc'ns, Inc. v. L.A. Cellular Tel. Co.*, 20 Cal. 4th 163,
13 180 (1999). The California Supreme Court has recognized that a practice may be
14 “unfair” if it offends public policy, is immoral, unethical, oppressive, or
15 unscrupulous, or causes injury to consumers that outweighs its benefits. *Id.*

16 The FAC alleges that Fenix operated and profited from a system that allowed
17 Agencies to impersonate Creators in sexually and emotionally intimate chats
18 without the Fan's knowledge or consent. FAC ¶¶ 98–102, 130–149. This
19 impersonation occurred through a platform that Fenix controlled and monetized,
20 and in some cases involved the distribution of private communications and
21 sensitive content to third parties. FAC ¶¶ 156–159. The resulting harm to
22 consumers—including emotional manipulation and financial loss—was severe.
23 FAC ¶¶ 81–94.

24 Fenix's defense is that it cannot be liable for these harms because its Terms
25 of Service disclosed that Creators could use third parties. Motion at 10–11. But this
26 argument fails under longstanding California law. “A business may not escape UCL

1 unfairness liability merely by disclosing or disclaiming its conduct in a user
2 agreement.” *People v. McKale*, 25 Cal. 3d 626, 635 (1979). The issue is not
3 whether the Terms legally permitted impersonation, but whether the conduct itself
4 was unfair. Plaintiffs plausibly allege that it was.
5

6 These allegations state a claim under the unfair prong regardless of whether
7 any affirmative misrepresentation occurred. The platform-level orchestration of
8 intimate impersonation for profit—without user knowledge or informed consent—
9 meets the standard for an unfair business practice.
10

11 **4. Under the UCL’s Unlawful Prong, Plaintiffs allege multiple
predicate violations.**

12 The “unlawful” prong of the UCL “borrows” violations of other laws and
13 treats them as independently actionable. *Cel-Tech*, 20 Cal. 4th at 180. Here, the
14 FAC identifies multiple predicate statutes, including California’s statutory fraud
15 provisions (Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1709–1710), the False Advertising Law (Cal. Bus. &
16 Prof. Code § 17500), and the federal and state wiretap and privacy statutes. FAC
17 ¶¶ 538–543.
18

19 Fenix argues that Plaintiffs fail to plead any predicate statute with sufficient
20 specificity. Motion at 19–20. But this is incorrect. For example, Plaintiffs allege
21 that Fenix’s conduct constitutes “deceit” under Cal. Civ. Code § 1709, because it
22 involved the concealment of material facts (the use of Chatters), with knowledge of
23 their falsity and an intent to induce Fans to part with money. FAC ¶¶ 524–529. That
24 is a complete claim under § 1709, and thus a valid UCL predicate.
25
26 Because each of these predicate violations is sufficiently pled, the FAC also states a
27 claim under the UCL’s unlawful prong.
28

L. The FAC also states a claim under California's False Advertising Law.

The FAL prohibits any advertising that is untrue or misleading and made with actual or constructive knowledge of its falsity. Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500. “Advertising” under the statute includes any promotional message that is intended to induce a consumer to make a purchase. *Id.*

Plaintiffs allege that Fenix’s standardized promotional statements—such as the promise of “authentic” or “direct” interactions with specific Creators—were false and misleading because Fenix knew that many Creators did not operate their own chats. FAC ¶¶ 98–102, 130–149. Fenix nonetheless continued to display these representations on Creator profiles, without disclosing the presence of Chatters. These statements are properly understood as advertising: they appear in marketing materials and user-facing features, and they are designed to induce Fans to subscribe, tip, or purchase content.

Fenix argues that it cannot be liable under the FAL because it did not personally make any false statements. Motion at 19–20. That is both factually and legally incorrect. The FAC alleges that Fenix crafted and embedded these representations into the platform interface. FAC ¶¶ 98–100. Liability under the FAL attaches to those who disseminate false or misleading statements with actual or constructive knowledge of their falsity. *See* Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500. No intent to deceive is required.

Plaintiffs further allege that Fenix had constructive and actual knowledge of the falsity of these statements, based on its extensive monitoring capabilities, awareness of Agency involvement, and financial entanglement in the impersonation scheme. FAC ¶¶ 133–149.

These allegations are sufficient to plead a claim under the FAL.

* * *

The FAC alleges that Fenix Defendants knowingly promoted, enabled, and profited from deceptive impersonation practices that misled Plaintiffs and other consumers. That conduct is actionable under each of the UCL's three prongs and under the FAL. Fenix's defenses—grounded in overreading its Terms of Service and mischaracterizing the claims as third-party conduct—are both legally and factually unsupported. The motion should be denied.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court deny the Fenix Defendants' Motion to Dismiss.

DATED: July 17, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

By /s/ Robert B. Carey

Robert B. Carey (*pro hac vice*)

Leonard W. Aragon (*pro hac vice*)

Michella A. Kras (pro hac vi

HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

11 West Jefferson, Suite 1000

Phoenix, Arizona 85003

Telephone: (602) 840-5900

Facsimile: (602) 840-3012

Email: rob@hbsslaw.com

leonarda@hbsslaw.com
1111111@1111111

michellak@hbsslaw.com

Christopher R. Pitoun (SBN 290235)

HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

1 301 N. Lake Avenue, Suite 920
2 Pasadena, California 91101
3 Telephone: (213) 330-7150
4 Facsimile: (213) 330-7152
Email: christopherp@hbsslaw.com

5 Andrea R. Gold (*pro hac vice*)
6 David A. McGee (*pro hac vice*)
7 Shana H. Khader (*pro hac vice*)
TYCKO & ZAVAREEI LLP
8 2000 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 1010
9 Washington, DC 20006
Phone: (202) 973-0900
10 Facsimile: (202) 973-0950
Email: agold@tzlegal.com
dmcgee@tzlegal.com
skhader@tzlegal.com

13 Keith T. Vernon (*pro hac vice*)
14 TIMONEY KNOX LLP
15 1717 K Street NW, Suite 900
16 Washington, DC 20006
Phone: (202) 349-9864
17 Facsimile: (215) 540-2643
Email: kvernon@timoneyknox.com

18 Andrew C. Stone (*pro hac vice*)
19 Seth T. Goertz (*pro hac vice*)
20 DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
21 2325 E Camelback Road, Suite 300
22 Phoenix, AZ 85016
Phone: (602) 735-2691
23 Facsimile: (602) 926-2471
Email: stone.andy@dorsey.com
goertz.seth@dorsey.com

25 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

The undersigned, counsel of record for Plaintiffs, certifies that this brief is one of three consolidated oppositions to Defendants' Motions (Dkts. 121-129), and contains 11,515 words which complies with the aggregate word limit specified in this Court's July 15, 2025 Order, Dkt. 137.

Dated: July 17, 2025

HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP
/s/ Robert B. Carey
Robert B. Carey